

## **REMARKS**

Applicant submits herewith an interview summary of the interview conducted with the Examiner on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007 to discuss the cited art of Shaffer.

### **Interview Summary**

Discussed were that neither the teachings of MIME conversion nor the teachings of Shaffer for file format conversion addressed (nor state for that matter) the claimed data resolution problem handling, where the data size contained in the attachment document as received is greater than the data size of the converted data sent to the network terminal, as matched to the data resolution capabilities of the network device according to knowledge of a specified data resolution level for the converted attachment data. Discussed was that Shaffer does not teach or even suggests this use of a specified data resolution level. Further discussed was that MIME converted ASCII characters are not intended to be "presented" on the network terminal, rather to be used as an intermediate form suitable for message transmission purposes only. The conclusion given in the interview was that the amended claims submitted on September 4, 2007 overcame the deficiencies of Shaffer, however a new search would be conducted by the Examiner.

### **102(e) Rejection**

Applicant has reviewed the newly cited art of Adams that was used to reject the claims 1, 10, 19, 23, 34, 36, and 38 submitted on September 4, 2007, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). Applicant disagrees with this new rejection, as Adams, taken on the whole, does not contain any implicit nor explicit teachings that would lead one to the invention as originally claimed.

However, Applicant has noted allowed claims 2-5, 11-14, 20-22, 24-32 and 39, as well as claims 35 and 37 in combination with their base claims. Accordingly,

In order to further expedite prosecution of the instant application, Applicant has amended their claims to accord to the allowed claims given in Items 3 and 4 of the current office action. Further, Applicant reserves the right to file the rejected claims, unamended, in further continuations to seek the scope of protection commensurate with the contents of Applicant's specification and the lack of prior art cited thus far to support rejection of that desired scope.

In particular, the cited passage of column 2, lines 39-42 of Adams does not relate to the invention as claimed, as Adams only states that the device "may have to ignore much of the image data" and "the image may not be displayed properly, if at all, via the pervasive computing device display unless the size of the image is reduced". No mention is given other than what is already known in the art, namely that large data files may not display properly, if at all, and that the large data files must be truncated for proper display. No mention is given as to known "data resolution capabilities", as claimed.

Further, Applicant has also reviewed the cited passages column 3, lines 41-45 and column 6, lines 40-45. Both of these passages only relate to "modify elements within an HTML file", such as "selected elements may be replaced with alternative elements". Again, no mention is given to "a specified data resolution level" for handling "data resolution capabilities". Applicant submits that this Adams passage is clearly related to replacing undisplayable elements with other displayable elements, which has nothing to do with recognizing the specified data resolution level of the device and dealing with it.

Further, the Examiner states that passage column 4, line 10 relates to "at least one data filtration parameter". Applicant submits that "based on the user's preferences" does not give explicit nor implicit teaching of "at least one data filtration parameter" as claimed. User preferences is given by Adams by example in line 11 as "transcoding text elements into audio files", which is clearly not related to "reducing the number of bytes" as claimed.

The other cited Adams passages by the Examiner are also similar, in that they are all taken out of context with one another. Applicant submits that no one would be able to come to the invention as originally claimed using the incomplete teachings of Adams, without resorting to Applicant's specification.

In light of the above remarks and the amendments submitted herewith, the Applicant submits that the currently pending claims are novel and inventive over the cited references to date, taken either alone or in combination.

It is believed that the above remarks and amendments submitted herein have placed this present application in condition for allowance, and a Notice thereof is requested. If the Examiner has further concerns, he is encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned agent at (416) 862-4318. All correspondence should continue to be directed to listed address shown below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Grant Tisdall  
Registration No. 53,902

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP  
Suite 1600, 1 First Canadian Place, 100 King Street West  
Toronto, Ontario  
Canada M5X 1G5  
(416) 862-7525

[TOR\_LAW87878871]